

12 OCT 1955

MEMORANDUM FOR: Colonel White

THROUGH : Mr. Lloyd

SUBJECT : Proposed Notice   "Criteria for Agency Sponsorship of Training at External Facilities"

1. The attached draft Notice is intended to establish criteria for Agency sponsorship of training at external facilities and, also, to indicate the kinds of external training which may not be undertaken at Agency expense.

2. ID/S Diary Notes for the period 7 - 11 March 1955 record that Matt Baird was asked to develop a regulation covering Agency policy on external training. Particular objectives or provisions of such policy are not there indicated.

3. The policy provisions of the proposed Notice are found in paragraph 3 of the attached draft. They are characterized as an extension or clarification of policies announced in December 1953 by   and in themselves seem reasonable and prudent. They do incorporate, nevertheless, some confusing language.

4. For example, what are the "competences peculiarly required by the intelligence profession"? If they can be distinguished or identified, certainly paragraph 4.a.(1) does not succeed in doing so. Perhaps a more realistic statement of criteria and one more easily understood would be "to develop competences required by the interests of the Agency."

5. The policy statement regarding the training of specialists in "neglected fields of concern to the intelligence profession" (paragraph 3.a.(2)) seems desirable particularly if the words "intelligence profession" are equated with "CIA". However, an enlargement of this policy is included elsewhere in the draft Notice and must be considered carefully.

6. Paragraph 4.b. illustrates several instances of "neglected fields" but also stakes OTR's claim to responsibility and authority for this program (see paragraph 4.b.(3)). The wisdom of this seems questionable. Any identification of neglected areas involves comment

Document No.	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 20px;"> </span>
No Change in Class.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Declassified	<input type="checkbox"/>
Class. Changed to:	TS, S, C
Next Review Date:	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 20px;"> </span>
Auth:	HR 70-3
Date:	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 0 20px;"> </span>

on the stewardship of the DD/P and DD/I and involves factors of which they are cognizant and Agency functions for which they are responsible. As the Director's principal staff officer for training matters I suppose the Director of Training could report on "voids" in training just as the Director of Personnel might report shortages and overages in the inventory of skills of staff employees. When all is said Patagonia should not qualify as "neglected" merely because it is a geographic and political fact regarding which the Agency has no expert but only because production of National Intelligence or execution of clandestine operations requires personnel expert in that remote area. If neither DD/I nor DD/P foresee such a requirement within the dim future they are unlikely to support the requisite training by providing slots and qualified students. Further, unless their judgment in the matter proved incorrect, there would be no opportunity to utilize the expertness of the newly-trained specialist.

7. Perhaps the most objectionable policy proposed is that found at paragraph 3.a.(3). Stated in rather obscure language this policy statement seems innocent at face value. However, the effect of such a policy as understood and administered by OTR is made clear at paragraph 4.c. The net result would seem to prohibit the Agency providing additional training in economics for the economists of OTR, further Russian language training for the Russian linguist or translator, and supplementary training in advanced management methods for the professional managers. This hardly seems desirable.

8. No doubt the policies and interpretations proposed here are intended to eliminate abuses of the privilege of training. Neither instances nor frequency of abuse are cited. I believe much of the problem centers on the fact that all training is of value and benefit to the individual receiving it as well as to the Agency. This is compounded because the value to the individual is apparent or assumed while the benefit to the Agency frequently is obscure and cannot become an item of property or even of exclusive control. So it is with many things. It may be of major benefit to me to be sent at public expense to my home city but doing so is not a breach of public trust or administrative discretion so long as the purpose of the trip is to conduct legitimate public business. Those who order or condone travel at public expense solely for the benefit of the traveler can be disciplined or punished for their malfeasance. But to require that public business be accomplished only thru use of individuals who did not thereby derive tangible personal benefits would be to create an administrative monster. The real criteria for all training at Agency expense must remain that the training requested is a reasonable furtherance of the public interest under all the circumstances.

9. The proposed Notice includes matters of policy and has not been coordinated with interested Agency components. Thus it does not satisfy the formal requirements of the Regulatory System. Also, it is entirely too lengthy.

25X1 10. Recommendation: That the proposed Notice be returned to OTR with instructions that same be incorporated in revisions of [redacted] (now in process) and coordinated with all interested Agency components.

15/  
[redacted]

25X1

SA-DD/S:JER:dlc (11 Oct 55)  
Distribution:  
1-chrono  
1-subject  
1-JER